

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 10, 2008 from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, claims 1-6 and 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,982,804 to Frolik et al. (hereinafter “Frolik”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,565 to Scheidig et al. (hereinafter “Scheidig”) and allegedly well known prior art, and claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Scheidig, and allegedly well known prior art and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,707 to Taniguchi et al. (hereinafter “Taniguchi”).

Applicant respectfully provides the following:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Scheidig, and allegedly well known prior art, and claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Scheidig, allegedly well known prior art, and Taniguchi. M.P.E.P. § 2141 sets forth the *Graham* factual enquiries that should be considered when making an obviousness rejection under Section 103: 1) ascertaining the scope and content of the prior art; 2) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and 3) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. (Citing *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966).) In addition, M.P.E.P. §§ 2141 and 2142 set forth that “the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” (Citing *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR)*, 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).)

For a rejection under Section 103 to stand, it must explicitly set forth 1) factual findings showing that each claim element was known in the art at the time of the invention, and 2) factual findings showing that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, would have found it obvious to modify or combine the teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. (See, for example, the enumerated required articulations set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2143 for each lettered rationale.) Applicant respectfully submits that the references in the Office Action, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations claimed in the claim set provided herein.

Independent claim 1, as amended, requires: “In a printing environment, a method for specifying application specific printing requirements for an arbitrary printing device, the method comprising: providing a printing device having a plurality of default device setting sets stored in memory of the printing device; configuring one of the default device setting sets using a pseudo print job by selectively associating an application specific name with one of: (i) a standard default setting set; and (ii) an application specific default setting; identifying which of the default device setting sets are to be used in rendering a particular print job; and rendering the print job without using at least one of (i) a fully compatible printer driver and (ii) a printer definition that specifies an implementation of printing requirements for the printing device.” Independent claim 14 includes similar limitations. Such limitations are not taught by the combination of Frolik, Scheidig and the allegedly well known prior art.

Frolik teaches a computer system application that selects printer settings from a variety of sources. (Abstract) In Frolik, the printer settings may be stored in control files on a document server that delivers documents on request to a client (Col 3 line 64-Col 4 line 4), and they may be stored in data files in memory on a client computer (Col 4 lines 24-25, Col 4 line 59-Col 5 line 6)

(See also Fig 1.). When printing occurs, the printer settings are selected from the data files in the client computer's memory. (Fig 3 and Col 7 lines 12-34) Frolik does not disclose a printing device having a plurality of default device setting sets stored in memory of the printing device and configuring one of the default device setting sets using a pseudo print job, as is required by claim 1. For at least these reasons, Frolik does not teach all elements of independent claim 1.

Scheidig also fails to teach the recited claim limitations. Scheidig teaches printers capable of operating using a plurality of printer languages. (Col 1 lines 9-10) In Scheidig, various setup data sets are stored in a control panel unit of a high-performance printer, and upon reception of print data, the printer detects the printer language of the print data and loads the corresponding data set. (Col 2 lines 56-64; Col 5 lines 53-60) Scheidig does not teach configuring one of the default device setting sets using a pseudo print job as is required by claim 1. Therefore, Scheidig also fails to teach the elements of claim 1 not taught by Frolik.

The allegedly well known prior art also fails to teach the recited claim limitations, as the allegedly well known prior art is the use of a generic printer driver that is not fully compatible with the printer or a printer definition. As none of the cited references teach the recited claim limitations, the cited references, when combined, also fail to teach the recited limitations. Therefore, one of skill in the art would not have found the claimed invention of claim 1 obvious over the cited references, given the differences between the limited disclosure of the cited references and the claimed invention.

Independent claim 14 contains similar limitations to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and is therefore similarly allowable. Claims 2-10 and 15-20 depend from one of claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore similarly allowable.

Independent claim 11, as amended, requires: “A printing device comprising: a plurality of default device setting sets stored in memory of the printing device, wherein the default device setting sets are configured with an embedded device web page by selectively associating an application specific name with one of (i) a standard default setting set and (ii) an application specific default setting, and wherein one of the default device setting sets is used in rendering a particular print job without using at least one of (i) a fully compatible printer driver and (ii) a printer definition that specifies an implementation of printing requirements for the printing device.” Such limitations are not taught by the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Specifically, Frolik fails to teach default device setting sets that are stored in memory of the printing device and are configured with an embedded device web page. As discussed above, in Frolik, the printer settings may be stored in control files on a document server or in memory on a client computer. When printing occurs, the printer settings are selected from the data files in the client computer’s memory. In Scheidig, an operator inputs all setting data for different printer languages at a control panel unit of the high-performance printer. (Col 5 lines 22-28) Finally, the allegedly well known prior art is the use of a generic printer driver that is not fully compatible with the printer or a printer definition. As none of the cited references teach the recited claim limitations, the cited references, when combined, also fail to teach the recited limitations. Therefore, one of skill in the art would not have found the claimed invention of claim 11 obvious over the cited references, given the differences between the limited disclosure of the cited references and the claimed invention. Claims 12-13 depend from claim 11 and are therefore also allowable.


Applicant therefore respectfully requests removal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 10 day of July, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael H. Krieger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 35,232

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 321-4814
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893